STATEMENT OF WILLIAM CASEY, DIRECTOR,

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. Casey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to give you my views on the Senate Resolution to support the establishment of a National Historical Intelligence Museum. I am truly moved by this resolution's recognition of those Americans who have worked and sacrificed, from the first days of our Republic, to give our government the intelligence it has needed to prevail in war and to remain secure in peace.

CIA is a young organization, going back to only 1947, and its World War II progenitor, OSS, goes back only another six years to 1941. But American intelligence did not begin with OSS or CIA. As the resolution notes, General George Washington organized and relied upon a variety of intelligence activities in leading the 13 American colonies in the long war for independence, whose happy ending 200 years ago we celebrate this year.

I have done some research and writing on the American Revolution, and I claim that my first predecessor as Director of Central Intelligence was not Admiral Sidney Sours who was appointed Director of Central Intelligence by President Truman, but George Washington, who appointed himself. How did Washington's ragtag army, some 6000 or 8000 men for most of the war defeat what was then the most powerful nation in the world. Second only to Washington's qualities as a leader in this

achievement were his natural aptitude as a director and practitioner of intelligence and special operations and with General Greene and his lieutenants in the South, as a master of what we know today of guerrilla warfare.

The earliest predecessor of your Committee, Mr. Chairman, was the Secret Committee created by the Continental Congress for the covert procurement of arms in September of 1775, and the Committee on Secret Correspondence created two months later for the purpose of corresponding with our firends in Great Britain, in Ireland, and other parts of the world, notably our adversaries as well as our firends in Europe.

But to these Committees, the Continental Congress appointed its strongest members, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Morris, Silas Dean, John Day, Benjamin Harrison, Richard Henry Lee, John Dickerson, and under the authority of these Committees, Benjamin Franklin and Silas Dean carried out the first American special operations in arranging the clandestine acquisition and financing in Europe and shipment to America of the weapons needed to sustain the American Revolution. And to meet his needs, his military needs as Commander in Chief over here, Washington gradually developed a working intelligence network and became his own intelligence chief.

The intelligence process consists of three broad steps.

The identification and collection of information. The evaluation and analysis of that information, drawing inference and

conclusions relating to necessary decisions. And thirdly the dissimination to convey facts and conclusions to the commanders and the policy makers needing them.

It is not an exaggeration to say that Washington himself performed all of these functions. In his letters time and again he specifies the plea for the kind of information he needs to estimate the enemies plans and intentions. Most of the analysis and interpretation of the facts collected for him took place in his own mind, and his massive correspondence was a major means of conveying relevant information to his commanders and the Congress.

The special operations, intelligence activities and the resulting deception which enabled Washington to keep his tiny force alive and ultimately defeat the trained British army at Yorktown were critical to winning our independence. And this has continued down to this day, notably during World War II and the reading of German messages, the deception which kept 15 German divisions away from the beachhead at Normandy, and the development and support of French resistance forces which protected the flank of the Third and the Seventh American Armies as they liberated France.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I take you briefly through this history of intelligence related to our military and political challenge because I believe it important to our national spirit that all of this be remembered by our people. It is important to the

and the understanding of young people be engaged at an early age, and the challenge and the opportunity which these activities offered in the past as well as in the future. It is important that the American public recognize and understand the importance of intelligence, and for this the public needs information and education about the role of intelligence in our nation's history.

And as this resolution suggests, one highly important way of educating and informing the public would be to establish a national museum where intelligence objects of historical interest could be collected, preserved and exhibited to the public. And I am grateful that all of you on this Committee have joined your Chairman in sponsoring this resolution to establish a museum that will commemorate the contribution of thousands of men and women of American intelligence since 1775.

In inviting me to testify today, Mr. Chairman, you and your Vice Chairman asked my thoughts not only on the importance of having such a museum, which I have just shared with you, but also what might be included in it and how I think that such a project might be carried forward. Since the question of what such a museum should contain depends to a considerable degree on how it is set up, let me first comment on the kind of institution that I believe is envisioned, and which I think would be appropriate.

At the outset I would say that I am glad the movement to

SSCI FORM 23

establish a National Historical Intelligence Museum is a private initiative. I think its advocates are right in wanting to create a public but not a governmental museum. I agree with those that hold that it would probably not be appropriate for CIA, the intelligence community as a whole, or the Federal government to fund or administer such a museum. Such a museum should be entirely free of the constraints of national security classification. That is, all of its holdings should be freely accessible to the public. It should also be independent in managing its affairs, especially in deciding what and which to exhibit. For these reasons, it should not be an appendage or adjunct to CIA or other organizations in the intelligence community, but entirely independent of them.

Indeed, for such a museum to depend upon intelligence agencies for funds, exhibits and direction, might encourage the public to believe it was merely a government public relations operation. Thus, I find myself in sympathy with the proponents of this museum who believe that the general public interest, the functional requirements of intelligence work, and the benefits of freedom from official constraints all argue for an independent institution, albeit possibly some degree of government support. Having said all this, I can immediately add that CIA, and I am sure other components of the intelligence community as well, will be glad to support and cooperate with a National Historical Intelligence Museum in every legitimate way that we

can.

This brings me to the question of what should be included in such a museum. Here I would focus primarily on what might be expected to come from CIA and the intelligence community. And I must say frankly that what CIA can contribute here will almost certainly be quite limited. This is first because we do not have many objects or artifacts that could be exhibited in a museum: We mainly produce paper, and the release to the public of some of our records is, I think, a separate issue which is dealt with regularly in other forums, arenas.

Beyond this, our need to protect our sources and menthods means we must keep much of our material secret for very considerable lengths of time, sometimes long after the actual substance of a report may be general knowledge. Within these constraints, however, there are some things that we could offer to such a museum. We have, for example, been able to release U-2 photography to the John F. Kennedy Library for its documentation of the Cuban Missile Crisis. We have also given the Smithsonian Institution related U-2 materials for exhibits there. We have shared with the public the results of applying advanced photo interpretation techniques to World War II aerial photography by releasing detailed analysis of Nazi death camps, and evidence of the Soviet massacre at Katyn. While I am confident we can continue to release this kind of intelligence material from time to time, I would not want to mislead anyone into expecting us to

be a major source of exhibits with this projected Historical Intelligence Museum.

Indeed, it seems to me that whil artifacts and intelligence and other historical documents would be an essential component of an intelligence museum, most of the presentation and most of the interest would be created by exhibits showing in historical context how intelligence contributed to desirable military and political results. This can be done largely with exhibits using historical material and material available in the public record, the product of scholars engaged in historical analysis.

I have in mind how Washington succeeded in getting the British commander in New York to bring back forces from Virginia to New York City by feinting an attack on New York as he and General Rochambeau marched their forces through Westchester County and down through Jersey and down into Virginia. This kind of a story can be told with legends on maps, accompanied by actual messages and orders which are available from the historical record.

The same kind of thing can be done with the deception which kept 15 German divisions 100 miles north of Normandy. If they could have been put into Normany they could have pushed our forces back into the Channel. Also this applies to French resistance to develop protection for General Patton's flank as he raced up the route -- General Patch's flank as he raced up the route of Napoleon from Mediterranean to Grenoble, and

- -13

General Patton's flank as he raced from Brittany to Lorraine. All this kind of thing can be done with maps and reports and messages supporting the maps which are publicly available.

I have seen this in actual practice, visiting intelligence resistence museums which have been established and are functioning at Oslo in Norway, in Copenhagen in Denmark and in Paris in France. I was told in Norway just last week that the resistance museum there still receives more visits than any other tourist attraction in Norway, including the major Viking ships and the Kon Tiki raft, which are the subject of dramatic exhibits in Norway. But the resistance museum outdraws them.

Senator Hecht, in conclusion, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify before you today and for the support all of you have shown by joining our Chairman in sponsoring this important resolution.

Senator Hecht (presiding). Thank you, very much, Mr. Casey. And I want to say that our Chairman had to leave to make sure there was an authorization bill passed for the Intelligence Community.

Mr. Casey. I'll happily excuse him for that.

Senator Hecht. Our next witness is Walter Pforzheimer.

Mr. Pforzheimer is an intelligence expert and noted collector of rare books, including those on intelligence. A lawyer and Yale graduate, Mr. Pforzheimer has been in the intelligence business since December the 8th, 1942. He was the

22,

first legislative counsel for the CIA. From 1956 to 1974 he served as curator of the CIA Historical Intelligence Collection. I understand he has brought items from his own collection, and when you testify maybe you will want to speak about these different items.

Mr. Pforzheimer.